

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

ROY BORDAMONTE

Plaintiff,

v.

HETOR LORA, LUIS GUZMAN, GARY
SCHAER, ALEX BLANCO, RALPH
DANNA, CARLOS FIGUEROA, individually
and in their official capacities, and the CITY
OF PASSAIC.

Defendants.

17-cv-2642

ORDER

WILLIAM J. MARTINI, U.S.D.J.:

Before the Court is Plaintiff Roy Bordamonte's Motion for Reconsideration of this Court's October 28, 2020 Order granting Defendants' summary judgment motions. ECF No. 116. The Court will reconsider a prior order only where a different outcome is justified by: (1) intervening change in law; (2) availability of new evidence not previously available; or a (3) need to correct a clear error of law or manifest injustice. *United States v. Davis*, 05-cr-382, 2012 WL 1950217, at *1 (D.N.J. May 30, 2012), *aff'd*, 514 F. App'x 97 (3d Cir. 2013) (cleaned up and citations omitted). Plaintiff's reconsideration motion is, in substantial part, copied verbatim from Plaintiff's opposition to summary judgment. Compare ECF No. 116-2 at 2-6, 7-12 with ECF No. 96. The Court already carefully considered Plaintiff's opposition for summary judgment. The limited portions of Plaintiff's filing that the Court has not already considered do not present any of the three grounds for reconsidering the Court's October 28, 2020 Order. Finally, because Plaintiff filed his Motion for Reconsideration 15 days after the Court entered its Order granting summary judgment, it is untimely. See Local Rule 7.1(i) ("a motion for reconsideration shall be served and filed within 14 days after the entry of the order or judgment on the original motion . . ."); *Bridges v. Colvin*, 136 F. Supp. 3d 620, 629 (3d Cir. 2015) (holding that the court did not need to reach the merits of the movant's claims because the motion for reconsideration was untimely).

IT IS on this 16th day of December, 2020, **ORDERED** that Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration, ECF No. 116, is **DENIED**.


WILLIAM J. MARTINI, U.S.D.J.